P761 of 97

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1890-91

192 .

(L. R.)

File No. 80 of

Serial Nos. 1 to

Later references.

L. R. 116 of 97.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

In ~~Part~~ B for May 1892

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Puttanna of Kestur, Maudya taluk, regarding the Shanbhogiship of Kestur.

WD 2288—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

Appn no 8 of 1891

Appt
Petitioner

Respts
1 Subramanya
2 Venkata subba
son of no 1
3 Venkatanarasa
brother of no 1.

~~Appn no 8 of 1891 presented by the Petitioner on~~

In 1890, appt ~~presented a memorial~~ claimed the office of Shanbhog in the Village of Kestur by a Memorial to the Dy Collr, & the Asst Dy Collr passed an order on 3d Sept 1890 that he might do the duties of the office, but subsequently on an appeal from the Respts, an enquiry was made, & having appeared that the 1st Respt was the real Shanbhog of the Village, & that alone he did the duties of the office though he was nominally decreased in 1875, the Dy Collr ordered the office to be registered in the name of the 2d Respt & appointed the 3d Respt as his Gumastah — The appeal is against this order which is dated 25 Sept 1890.

There is nothing to show that

appl. has any right to the office, or that he ever performed the duties of the office — The appeal in the first dismissed. Appl is at liberty to establish his right by a regular suit.

RCP

6/5/91

sec 51

Mr Copeland
that the appeal
has been dismissed.
He is at liberty
to establish his
right by a regular suit.

RCP

(3)

L. R. 80-90-1

Appeal is within time.
Petition sufficiently stamped
Copy of order produced
Para 1 & 2 of Rule 1 of Ord. XLI
Intercalated by the Court
5/5/91 AJ

Appeal

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 .

No. 57.

Name of Petitioner.
Poorna Shanbogue.

Village.
Kolthoor

Taluk.
Honnavar

District.
Kanara

Date of Arzi.
4-4-91

Date of Receipt.
7-4-91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

Court fee Rs 2-8-0 paid

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner begs to
to appeal against the ord
No. 877 passed by the Deputy C
in his case.

The case as mention
in the appeal petition is a
follows:
Where Kolthoor and 4 other
villages ~~were granted in~~ Inam
~~villages~~ the services of a Gov
Shanbogue were dispensed
with; then one Subramania
Konica elected the necessa
hands in favour of the Inam
dars was appointed Acc
Shanbogues of these villages

Bill- th
R Re

Lecidatory the petitioner was appointed allowing the Office, even though Said Soobramaniah was appointed.

Subsequently in 1874, the petitioner succeeded to the Shanbogueship of Veathoor.

Some time afterwards Said Soobramaniah having misappropriated Some of the Inam villages Collections, an order was passed in the year 1875 by Competent authorities that he must never again be permitted to act as Shanbogue and as there were Inam villages and as he was newly appointed he could not petition the Government for having the Said Shanbogueship registered in his own name.

Thus being left without an Office, and being unable to seek the Government help the thought of usurping into the petitioners place.

For this purpose as applied to the Depu. Comm.

(5) No. 72. K. (2)

L. R. 80-90-2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 57
dated 4th April 1891 received at the
Dewan's Office from Poolana,
Shanbogue of Kesthoor,
Mandya Taluk,

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~ with its 2 enclosures, to the Dy Comr,
Mysore Distt, for the
submission of Progs.
& precis thereof

By Order,

For Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
22/6/1891.

Drafted as per
Rs order.

(6) Nov

L.R. 80-90-3 (General Serial No. 30.) (3) 1891. P. 73

From

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE MYSORE DISTRICT

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 31st December 1891.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.1 file

General No. 828

No.

His Official Memo No. 8964/184 dated 13th December 1891, forwarding for Submission of Proceedings with Precis, a petition from Puttiah Shanbhogue of Kestoor.

With reference to the above has the honor to submit the Records and a Precis called for in the above, received with Francis Rocks Sub Division Office Docket No. 733 dated 24th Instant.

The Petition and its Enclosures received with the Memo under reply are also filed in the Records.

By Lieutenant Colonel

for Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District

Petition off
21/12

Submitted
to the Council.
N
1/1/92

Read
8/1/92

8/1

Rd 5-1-May 1892
11/1/92 Mark 11/1/92
N

As
5-1-92

(D

(3/4)

Précis.

One Venkat Narsiah petitioned to the Amildar, praying that as the hereditary Office of the Shanbogue of Kesture belonged to him and his brother Subramaniah, and as he had heard that the latter had been dismissed, the Baramand may be made entirely in his name. Thereupon the Amildar examined Subramaniah. He admitted that in a criminal charge brought against him and the Sheikdar, he was dismissed in 1875. But urged that the order was not carried into effect and he was allowed to continue in his duties. He produced several documents to shew that he was the Sheikdar, and prayed that his minor son may be made the Baramdar and his brother Venkat Narsiah appointed as his Gumasta.

Meanwhile Poottanah protested before the Sub-Divisional Officer against the claims advanced by Subramaniah representing that he was the right claimant. Poottanah's petition being referred to the Amildar, he was examined by that Officer: Poottanah stated that he succeeded Subbianah as Shanbaque of Kextur according to the partition effected between them and accordingly held the Office since 1875; he produced several 'dakkas' in support of his assertion with regard to Subramaniah, he stated that he had no connection whatever with the individual Shanbogue Hucs of Kextur, as he was only Patti Shanbaque of all the Inam village in the 'Phirka' including Kextur. That even this night, Subramaniah had lost after his dismissal and that it was only by the influence of the Inamdar that he wrongly continued to conduct the duties in spite of his dismissal.

The Auditor in submitting his opinion, recommended that the Jack of Subramaniah possessing the Vatt Shanboguy hueh was not clear from the record and that as his dismissal was only a departmental punishment after the criminal charge of embezzlement had broken down, and as he had, however, continued to conduct the duties of the Office even after his dismissal, his son's name may be registered and Venkat Ramaiah appointed as his gumasta.

The Sub-Division Officer held that as Poothiah was shown to have conducted the duties since 1875, he should not be disturbed in his Office and Subramaniah be left to establish his claim in a proper court.

On appeal the order of the Sub-Division Officer was reversed, as it appeared that Subramaniah continued to

be conducting the duties ever since 1875 even after his dismissal - But under the circumstances, Subramaniah's minor son may be appointed as Karnavar and Venkiah Ramaiah, his guardian.

Poottanah appeals against the above order.

Sub Division Officer,
French Rocks.

21

(157)

(General Serial No. 30.)

L. R. 80-90-4

From 1892. (5)

To The Dy Commr

Dated 16th May 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 2745 R.
R No 94

Ordering that Poothanna of Kestūr has no right to the Shanbogue of that Inam village, and that he is at liberty to establish his right, if any, by a regular Suit.

(16)

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 8 of 1891

Appellant. Vs. Respondents

~~Subbiah~~
Poothanna
of Kesture
Mandya Taluk

1 Soobramanayya
2 Venkatasubbiah
son of No 1
3 Venkatanarasiah
brother of No 1

Decision. 7/5/92

In 1890, Appellant claimed the Office of Shanbogue in the Inam village of Kesthure by a miscellaneous Petition, and the Sub Division Officer issued an order on 30th Septr 1890 that he might discharge the duties of his Office, but subsequently on an appeal from the Respondents, an enquiry was made, and it having appeared that the 1st Respondent was the real Shanbogue of the village, and that he alone did the duties of the Office, though he was nominally dismissed in 1875, the Deputy Commissioner ordered the Office to be registered in the name of the 2d Respondent and appointed the 3d Respondent as his gumastu. The appeal is against this

order which is dated 25th November 1890.

There is nothing to show that appellant has any right to the office, or that he ever performed the duties of the office. The appeal is therefore dismissed. Appellant is at liberty to establish his right, if any, by a regular suit

"By order."

16/5/92

Chief Secretary

2745 of 17 do 20th " May 1892
0 no 94

Copy forwarded to the Dy. Commr. Hyderabad for information with the ver: papers received with his No 828 31-12-91.

By order.

Draft

Chief Secretary

(4) (18)

No. 8
Appellant
Puttia

L.R. 80-90-5 th

Endorsement.

Respondents
1. Subramanayya
2. Venkatasubbu son of No 1
3. Venkatanarasiah brother of No 1

In reply to -his- Petition dated 4th April 91, Poothali of Keshin, Nuggur Taluk, is informed that his appeal has been rejected. He is at liberty to establish his right, if any, by a ~~is informed that~~ regular suit.

2. The rec: are returned

16/5/92

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department,
May 1892.

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Government Central Press Bangalore.—28-9-91—1000.

Issued with enclosures
20 — 5 — 92